



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,828	10/25/2001	Wolfgang Liedtke	600-1-287N	2548
23565	7590	06/29/2004		
KLAUBER & JACKSON 411 HACKENSACK AVENUE HACKENSACK, NJ 07601			EXAMINER GUCKER, STEPHEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/027,828	LIEDTKE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen Gucker	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,5 and 7-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,15-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-2, 4, 6, and 15-16, filed 3/26/04, is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no search burden exists between the various inventive groups. This is not found persuasive because the search and examination of the other groups are not co-extensive and overlapping, regardless of the PTO's classifications of the inventions due to the vast amount of database, foreign patent, and non-patent literature that must be searched in addition to US patents. Furthermore, the enablement of each invention is considered separately and is partly based on an extensive search of the state of the patent and particularly the non-patent prior art for each separate invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 3, 5, and 7-14 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 3/26/04.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the

Art Unit: 1647

invention. Although Applicant asserts that disorders may be treated by modulating VR-OAC, an adequate written description, guidance, and/or working examples are not taught by the specification to enable the treatment of any disorder. The specification fails to provide a nexus between any of the long list of disorders listed and whether such disorders have as a basis for their pathogenesis the VR-OAC. Additionally, the specification fails to teach in any disorder whether or not the VR-OAC should be modulated up or down in response to that specific disorder. If the VR-OAC is involved in any disorder, knowing whether one would want to modulate it up or down is critical information needed to treat that disorder in order to prevent the treatment from making the disorder worse. The specification does not provide any description, guidance, or working examples as to what an agonizing modulator to the VR-OAC would be in terms of chemical formula or structure. In the absence of any of this information, it is entirely unpredictable how the skilled artisan would carry out the methods as claimed to treat any disorder with a reasonable expectation of success without resorting to undue experimentation.

5. Claims 1-2 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for antagonizing the VR-OAC by using an antibody, does not reasonably provide enablement for any other modulation. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Because of the lack of an adequate written description, guidance, and working examples as noted above, the only modulator enabled for the

Art Unit: 1647

VR-OAC would be an antagonizing antibody because an antibody could be reasonably made by immunizing an animal with the VR-OAC, separating and purifying said antibody, and then testing it for its ability to block the VR-OAC's channel function by steric hindrance.

6. No claim is allowed.


7. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technical Center 1600 general number which is (571) 272-1600.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gucker whose telephone number is (571) 272-0883. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 0930 to 1800. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached at (571) 272-0887. The fax phone number for this Group is currently (703) 872-9306.



Stephen Gucker

June 28, 2004



GARY KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600